



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

by the committee on program, with amendments here incorporated:

1. Whereas, War has been proved the most expensive, unjust, and ineffective means of settling international disputes, therefore be it

Resolved, That this conference stands unalterably against war, as a means of settling international disputes, not only as a general principle, but in this present crisis as well, and be it further

Resolved, That the President and Congress of the United States be asked to take steps to settle questions that may arise during the crisis by conciliatory or judicial methods.

2. *Resolved*, That this conference stand unequivocally by the provisions of the United States Constitution dealing with the rights of free speech, free press, and free assemblage, and call upon the people to demand that Congress refrain from tinkering in any manner with the constitutional rights of the American people; and that, therefore, we stand firmly in opposition to the more dangerous and ill-defined provisions of the so-called "espionage" or Overman act.

3. Whereas, Militarism is contrary to the spirit of democracy, subversive of free popular government and institutions, and inculcates the warlike spirit, therefore be it further

Resolved, That we express ourselves as unalterably opposed to the inauguration of compulsory military training in State or Nation, and against conscription of any sort, whether in time of peace or in time of war. And be it further

4. *Resolved*, That we also oppose military training in the elementary or higher public schools and in the colleges of the United States, and that we cordially approve the adoption of sane and well-considered systems of physical training (*for both boys and girls*), free from military features or suggestion, as an essential part of their education.

The following resolution upon the question of a referendum vote on war was passed, but with the request by the minority that their disapproval, which was expressed by a respectable vote, be registered:

Speaking from our faith in democracy as well as from our hope of peace, we demand that in this as in all other international crises, no matter how grave the provocation, the question of war and peace, most vital of all questions in the life of a nation, be submitted to the people for an advisory referendum vote before Congress declare war, or before any irrevocable step is taken towards war.

At the final session of the conference an emergency committee reported for acceptance by the conference seven recommendations dealing with the present diplomatic crisis of this country. These recommendations, as they were accepted by vote of those present, are as follows:

1. That a delegation of five members, to be appointed by the chairman of the conference, Dr. Kirchwey, be sent in the name of the conference to interview the President of the United States, to lay before him the resolutions adopted by the conference, and to make an appeal to him to refrain from a resort to war for the solution of our difficulties with Germany.

2. That letters from individual members of the conference, the societies which were represented, and from public meetings held under their auspices, be sent to the members of Congress, for the purpose indicated in Number 1.

3. That a committee of three be appointed by the chairman of the conference, Dr. Kirchwey, for the purpose of preparing and publishing, at the earliest possible moment, a leaflet stating the reasons why this country must be kept out of war with Germany.

4. That the American Peace Society be requested to establish, as part of the plan of organization which is under consideration by the committee on organization, a bureau of information, and a clearing-house of cooperation among the various peace societies.

5. That this clearing-house be requested to organize immediately speaking tours, or flying wedges, which shall pro-

ceed at once throughout this country, East, West, North, and South, for the purpose of opposing militarism and promoting peace in general.

6. That the clearing-house establish a publicity bureau and procure the services of a publicity agent, who shall supply copy especially to the country newspapers, and if access to the metropolitan dailies can be secured in no other way, to insert such copy as advertisements in them. It is specially recommended that the publicity bureau stress the President's speech to the Senate on the 22d of January; and that this speech, properly subdivided and provided with headlines, shall be very widely distributed.

7. That, if the six recommendations noted above shall be adopted by the conference, they shall be printed on a separate slip and sent immediately to the societies represented in the conference for immediate action, in so far as this is possible.

A series of findings, as drawn from the proceedings at the various sessions, was presented by Mr. Call, chairman of the committee, to the conference, and accepted in the following form:

1. The members of the Conference of Peace Workers of America again solemnly pledge their support to the great and enduring faiths and achievements of American democracy, and they express unanimously their absolute confidence in the lofty sentiments expressed by President Wilson in his message to the United States Senate on January 22, 1917.

2. We reaffirm our approval of the so-called Hensley clauses in the last naval appropriations bill, which are now the law of our land, which are aimed towards securing a conference of nations, not later than the close of the present war in Europe, and which were passed in the interest of proportional disarmament and of the initiation of peaceful tribunals to settle international difficulties.

3. This conference unanimously regrets the recent action of the Naval Committee of the Senate by which action it cancelled the following lines from the present naval bill:

"It is hereby reaffirmed to be the policy of the United States to adjust and settle its international disputes through mediation or arbitration, to the end that war may be honorably avoided."

This conference respectfully petitions the Naval Committee of the Senate to restore these lines, embodying, as they do, such a fundamental American principle.

By vote of the conference, there were also accepted as the faith of those present the ten provisions for peace through justice known as the "Recommendations of Havana," adopted by the American Peace Society, January 20, 1917, and by the American Institute of International Law, January 22, 1917. These recommendations may be found printed upon the front cover of this magazine.

"A MIRACLE OF DEMOCRACY"

By ELEANOR M. MOORE, of Melbourne, Australia

FOR sixteen years past both men and women have been fully enfranchised in Australia, and have exercised their power freely at general elections, and also upon occasions of special referenda; but on October 28, 1916, when the burning question of conscription was submitted to the people, a record poll was taken. Of the 2,782,709 electors on the federal roll (of whom a little less than half are women), 2,231,116 cast effective votes. Included in this total are the 230,000 men on active service abroad. With the exception of these latter, every vote recorded meant the personal presence of the voter at a polling booth, no postal voting being permitted. In the sparsely populated districts inland this often

necessitated a rough journey of many miles, sometimes over partially flooded country; so that men who happened to be physically unfit and women in delicate health or in charge of little children whom they could not leave, were inevitably disfranchised. Those who were ill in hospitals or in their own city homes were placed at the same disadvantage. Yet, allowing for all this, and for those who through ignorance voted informally, and for those who through apathy or indecision did not vote at all, 80 per cent of the adult population of the whole continent turned out of their homes to record their opinion whether the government should have power to compel men to go abroad to war, and the opinion of the people, by a majority of 61,000, was "No."

The political situation thus created is of little moment beyond our own borders, but wherever the principles of militarism and democracy are in conflict (and in what civilized country today are they not in conflict?) interest must be felt in the results of this direct appeal to the popular will.

It is natural enough that a press which, before the referendum, represented the issue as between "the forces that make for national greatness, magnanimity of soul, far-sightedness, and patriotic sacrifice on the one side, and those in which the offscourings of crime, disloyalty, and meanness of spirit are arrayed on the other," should maintain that the event has proved the utter unfitness of the populace to be trusted to decide any great question of national policy. The statement of the Prime Minister, however, in his first review of the situation, strikes a different note. "We must remember that this is the first time in history that the whole people have ever been asked to make the many and great sacrifices which war entails"—in other words, to conscript themselves. This suggests a likelihood that other peoples, given an opportunity to answer the same question, would answer it in the same way, in which case the militarists would become a discredited minority in every country—a situation from which the happiest results might confidently be expected.

It should be borne in mind that this vote was not given by a people living in a normal state of peace, able to weigh coolly and freely all the issues involved. For over two years public feeling has been warped by war fever and public judgment biased by one-sided information. There is scarcely a family which has not a son or a friend at the front, and the strong sentiment arising from all these circumstances would naturally prompt compliance with the proposals strongly recommended by authority and warmly supported by the press. The great bulk of the people were exempt from military service in any case, by reason of age, sex, or other conditions. For them consent was much the easier and more attractive course, possessing all the lure of appearing a loyal, generous, self-sacrificing deed, while actually costing the doer nothing.

But at the crucial moment the Australian people dug its heels in and refused to give ground. There was no violence in the resistance. The special police on duty in the capitals on the day of the contest found the tedium of their patrol unrelieved by the need of making a single arrest. But the negative, though temperately and deliberately expressed, was none the less emphatic. Many

are the theories by which it is sought to account for this unexpected outcome.

"It was the labor vote, indifferent to national interests, selfishly eager to hold its own gains." But the labor element is distributed over all the states, of which three returned a majority for conscription. It is true that those electorates in which the labor interest is most solid were largely against the measure, but so were others in which the labor interest is negligible. Moreover, the labor government in power was itself divided, four to six, on the issue, and since a considerable proportion of the soldiers themselves are labor men who voluntarily enlisted, indifference to the national question cannot fairly be charged against their party.

"It was the women's vote, with its sentimental shrinking from forcing men to danger and death." One would fain wish this were true. It is not possible to make a reliable comparison of the voting of the sexes, the ballot papers being alike for both, but in the preliminary campaign there were as many women speakers advocating conscription as opposing it, and some of the principal women's organizations were strongly conscriptionist in sympathy. Again, in certain districts where the women's names on the roll greatly outnumber the men's, the returns showed a large majority favorable to conscription. On the other hand, there was held in Melbourne, a week before the event, a women's anti-conscription procession and demonstration, which was very largely attended, so that here again the interest appears to have been sharply divided.

"It was the fear of the farmers that labor would not be available for harvesting." Doubtless there is truth in this. The whole stability of Australia depends on the successful carrying on of its primary industries, and in this connection it is useless to talk of replacing men with women or boys. The farmer who cannot find even one woman to help his wife with the housework during the busy season knows, as he looks out across thousands of acres of ripening wheat, that unless men do that work it will remain undone. Yet this reasoning should be equally cogent for all districts, and a comparison of the voting in various agricultural centers shows curiously discrepant results.

"The Roman Catholic vote, being mainly of Irish origin, tends to be anti-imperial." This might have weight if the church had from the outset discouraged its members from taking part in the war. But such has not been the case. It has provided its quota both of fighting men and chaplains, and naturally so, for the majority of the Allies are of the Roman or Greek faith. Among the belligerents, the only two markedly Protestant countries, England and Germany, are pitted against each other in deadly enmity, and Roman Catholics who are British subjects would have an additional incentive to loyalty in their sympathy with their coreligionists in Belgium and France. The pro-militarist attitude of all orthodox churches is as marked here as elsewhere, but in enthusiasm for bloodshed as the only effective means of establishing righteousness the great Protestant churches have certainly outdistanced all competitors. Their advocacy of conscription has been proportionately fervent, and with the immense influence of the press thrown on the same side, the pressure was to many people irresistible.

But it was not for nothing that education has been free, compulsory, secular, and (until quite recently) non-military in this country. The habit of independent thought and action has a strong hold on the people. They have done wonderful voluntary service, but their spirit revolted against coercion. In all classes there were those for whom the fevered influences of the time were too strong; but to the majority the deliberate signing away of political liberty, their own or another's, proved unconquerably repugnant. One public man remarked that if a "No" vote were returned, in the face of pressure brought to bear in the other direction, it would be a miracle of democracy. That miracle has happened.

WOMEN AND THE WORLD CRISIS

By MARY E. WOOLEY

President, Mt. Holyoke College

WE HAVE passed through various stages in the last two and one-half years. First came the stage of incredulity—it was incredible, it could not happen, this monstrous thing which we call a world war. And then came indignation, hot indignation against the powers that we thought responsible for plunging the world into such chaotic misery, and after that eagerness to devise plans to end the war. And now? Often it seems as if we were beyond words, as if they were too trivial in the face of the tremendous realities which we are confronting. Steadiness, calmness, moderation in speech, loyalty, the elements of character which give strength to the government and help to uphold the hands of our President in these days of perplexity and responsibility—that the country has a right to expect from us all. Those of us who pray that an honorable peace may be maintained, believe with Professor Kirchwey, that: "If the war be forced upon us by enemies, within or without, the armies of the republic—surely second to none in patriotic devotion or in the spirit that makes for honorable victory—will be largely made up of those pacifists who are still striving to make reason and good-will prevail in a distracted world."

Last spring, in a lecture before the students of the University of Pennsylvania, David Starr Jordan, quoting William Stead's characterization of the college men of Great Britain, "the picked million," said of the college men of America:

"They are the men who must think for themselves, and the man who can think should be the man who can act. . . . Never in the history of the world was the need of wise leadership greater than now, never were the stakes so great, never was blind action more futile. . . . Hence the need for strong effort, for clear-headed, uncompromising wisdom, and the possession of such wisdom is the birthright of the educated man."

Never in the history of the world was the need of wise leadership greater than now—hence the need for strong effort, for clear-headed, uncompromising wisdom, and the possession of such wisdom is the birthright also of the educated woman. "To think clearly is to act rightly," adds Doctor Jordan. What the world needs in this crisis, "the greatest crisis of the civilized world,"

is human beings who can think and think clearly, that they may help to "disentangle the peoples of the world from those combinations in which they seek their own separate and private interests, and unite the people of the world to preserve the peace of the world upon a basis of common right and justice." Women are commonly supposed to have an aversion to war as women, to shrink naturally from its horrors, to dread supremely its devastations, the wreckage of home and all the terrible price paid in agony of body and anguish of soul. Today women are rising to a conception more than personal, are seeing through world eyes, realizing that their duty is not remedial only, in relief work, but also preventive, in the kind of preparedness which has been called "preparedness against the rebarbarization of the world." No true woman can be content to live on the surface in these fateful days, days that are to decide perhaps for generations whether war or law shall govern the world, whether might shall be right, or right shall be might. No mental discipline is too rigid, no application too unremitting to help her "see it through," enable her to understand, throw her influence, do her bit toward the realization of world unity, a league of nations which shall insure in some way, enforce, if that is the practicable first step, the peace of the world. If I may borrow from the words of the President of the League to Enforce Peace—"The actual dangers with which it—Germany's last action—brings us face to face, may seem to make what I have been discussing theoretical, tame, and inappropriate. The truth is, however, that this great crisis only emphasizes the importance of the purpose and plan of the League in the future history of this country."

As the great, great granddaughter of more than one soldier in the Revolution, the great granddaughter of a captain in the War of 1812, and the daughter of a man who was chaplain in the Civil and the Spanish wars, it is perhaps not strange that the duty of a woman to be a patriot seems to me a paramount one. But patriotism is defined differently from the definition of 1776, of 1812, or even of '61. We are seeing more and more clearly in these tragic days that to be a true American means thinking in new terms. We are realizing that the "nineteenth century pushed the idea of nationalism to its extreme limits," and that at its close there began to develop the new idea of *internationalism*. The President of the United States has blazed the trail for this advance, has challenged us with a new statement of "American principles, American policies . . . the principles and policies of forward-looking men and women everywhere." What shall be our response? Shall we throw ourselves against the advance of a new and greater patriotism, with our faces toward the past and refuse to see the dawn of a new day? Or shall we be worthy sons and daughters of the men and women whose memory we reverence, serving our day—our day of new conditions, new outlook, new responsibilities—with the undaunted courage, the clear vision, the lofty idealism with which they served their day, fifty years, a hundred years, almost a hundred and fifty years ago? Patriotism in the high sense in which our forefathers were patriots implies using every means in our power to make the principles for which they stood, justice and liberty and democracy,